REMARKS

This reply is submitted in response to the Office Action dated May 13, 2004, citing objections to claims 10-13 and 16-17 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, claims 1-8, 10-11, and 16 as being anticipated by Garcia, U.S. Patent No. 6,545,981, claim 9 as being unpatentable over Garcia in view of Passint et al., U.S. Patent No. 5,581,705, and claims 14-15 and 17 as being unpatentable over Garcia in view of Wiklund, U.S. Patent No. 6,452,926.

The amendment above and the remarks that follow address the points raised in the Office Action, and thereby, place this application in condition for allowance.

Specification

The specification has been amended so that the phase "Figure 9 illustrates" on page 7, line 32, is now "Figures 9A and 9B illustrate".

Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C.§ 112, second paragraph

Claims 10-13 and 16-17 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite. Claims 10, 11, 12, and 16 are rejected due to a lack of antecedent basis for the phrase "the sending node". The phrase "the sending node" in each of these claims has been amended to "the first node". Claim 17 is rejected for being indefinite regarding the phrase "the link". The phrase "the link" has been amended to "the first link". No specific objections were specified for claim 13.

Claims Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e)

Claims 1-8, 10-11, and 16 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Garcia, U.S. Patent No. 6,545,981.

Amended independent claim 1 is directed to a digital data system where a first node sends a plurality of message packets to a second node on a link that carries message packets. The second node returns a control symbol with a sequence identifier of the packet for each packet that is received by the second node, which is used by the first node to control the further transmission of message packets to the second node. Garcia does not teach or suggest, among

- 7 -

other things, returning a control symbol to the first node that includes a sequence identifier of the packet that has been received by the second node.

Dependent claims 2 and 3 have been cancelled. Dependent claims 4-6 each contain all features and limitations of claim 1, and are allowable for the same, and other reasons.

Independent claim 7 is directed to, among other things, the second node returning a control symbol indicating a packet error to the first node. Garcia does not teach or suggest returning a control symbol that indicates the packet error.

Dependent claims 8, 10, and 11 each contain all features and limitations of claim 7, and are allowable for the same, and other reasons.

Independent claim 16 is directed to the transmission sequence of one or more messages from a first node to a second node, where each message includes a sequence identifier in an initial portion of the message. The second node checks the initial portion to identify a faulty message reception, and communicates the sequence identifier to the first node with a symbol indicating whether the reception was proper. Garcia does not teach or suggest, among other things, returning the sequence identifier of the packet from the second node back to the first node.

Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Claim 9 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Garcia in view of Passint et al., U.S. Patent No. 5,581,705. Claim 9 is directed to the control symbol identifying the type of packet error. The secondary reference does not remedy the deficiencies of Garcia, specifically that Garcia does not teach sending a control symbol identifying the packet error. In Passint, the control symbol is sent independently of a message that indicates information regarding the error (col. 10, lines 1-6).

Claims 14-15 and 17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Garcia in view of Wiklund, U.S. Patent No. 6,452,926. Claim 14 is directed to, among other things, a message packet with a header portion and further portion, where at least part of the header portion can change as the message packet passes from the first link to the further link, and where at least part of the message packet is invariant. Garcia does not teach or suggest that the message packet contains a changeable part that changes as the message is passed between links in the system. The Examiner points to col. 2, lines 15-24, in Garcia, but these lines in Garcia

- 8 -

state that the sequence number of the message packets is stored locally in the sending and receiving nodes, and these stored sequence numbers are used by the receiver node to ensure the packets are received in proper order. The secondary reference does not remedy the deficiencies of Garcia in regard to the message packet having a changeable part. Dependent claim 15 contains all the features and limitations of claim 14, and is allowable for the same, and other reasons.

Claim 17 was amended to clarify that the control symbol sent from the second node to the first node includes a sequence identifier of the message packet, which is not present in Garcia. The secondary reference does not remedy this deficiency in Garcia.

Conclusion

In view of the above, Applicant respectfully submits that the claimed invention is patentable. Applicant therefore kindly requests consideration of all claims in light of the above remarks and allowance thereof.

The Examiner is also kindly requested to contact the undersigned if such would expedite examination and allowance of the application.

Dated: 9/27/04

Respectfully submitted,

By_____
David J. Powsner
Registration No.: 31,868
NUTTER MCCLENNEN & FISH LLP
World Trade Center West
155 Seaport Boulevard
Boston, Massachusetts 02210-2604
617-439-2000
Attorney for Applicant

1359337.1